

## Remarks

The various parts of the Office Action (and other matters, if any) are discussed below under appropriate headings.

Applicants note that this Supplemental Response is not intended to address the substantive aspects of the Office Action mailed on November 13, 2006. Rather, applicants submit this response with the request that the amendments herein be entered merely for the purpose of reducing or simplifying any issues for appeal.

### ***Telephone Interview***

A telephone interview was conducted with the Examiner on February 2, 2007, wherein certain §112 issues as set forth in the Office Action dated November 13, 2007 were discussed. As a result of the interview, the Examiner agreed that if a supplemental response was filed amending the claims to be consistent the Examiner's interpretation of the claims, then such amendments would be entered.

In the Office Action, the Examiner interpreted "projecting a first pattern on a substrate in a first area" as "fabricating a first pattern on a substrate in a first area". Further, the Examiner interpreted "projecting at least one test pattern on the substrate outside of the first area" as "fabricating at least one test pattern on the substrate outside the first area". During the interview, the Examiner agreed that the term "forming" may be substituted for the term "fabricating".

In accordance with the above, claim 1 has been amended to be consistent with the above acceptable language. Further, claims 2, 5 and 6 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "forming".

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, entry of the above amendments is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By /Kenneth W. Fafrak/  
Kenneth W. Fafrak, Reg. No. 50,689

1621 Euclid Avenue  
Nineteenth Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115  
(216) 621-1113

B:\V\AMD\AMDSPH1647US\AMDSPH1647US.R03.wpd